



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,939	02/01/2002	Guo-Qing Wei	2002P01703US	3791

7590

11/22/2005

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
186 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

STREGE, JOHN B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/072,939 ✓

Applicant(s)

WEI ET AL.

Examiner

John B. Strege

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-4, 12-15, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the projected and normalized images" in line 8, and "the error-of-fit" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 12, and claim 18 have the same limitations with the same antecedent basis problems. Claims 2-4, 13-15, and 19-21 are dependent on the above mentioned claims thus are rejected for the same reasons.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shiota USPGPUB 2002/0006226.

Shiota discloses a system for appearance based object detection (paragraph 55), the system comprising: a training unit for training images comprising at least eigenimages (paragraph 16); and a detection unit responsive to an input image, which input image has a different brightness and contrast (paragraph 6) than the trained images, for detecting objects corresponding to the trained images (paragraphs 54 and 55).

Regarding claim 9, as seen in figure 1 Shiota discloses a CPU (101).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1,3-4,10-12,14-15,18, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiota USPGPUB 2002/0006226, in view of Lowe USPN 6,711,293.

Shiota discloses a method for brightness and contrast normalization in appearance based object detection, the method comprising: extracting a plurality of training images (paragraph 16, and paragraphs 53-54); finding eigenimages corresponding to the training images (paragraph 16, and paragraph 60); receiving an

input image (paragraph 16); forming a projection equation responsive to the eigenimages (paragraph 16); solving for intensity normalization parameters (examiner interprets the process of removing shade from the image [paragraphs 61-63] as intensity normalization since it is described as a process to remove difference in conditions of image pickup since the light directions on an object differ [described in paragraph 6]); and computing projected and normalized images (paragraph 58, and 61).

Shiota does not explicitly disclose computing an error-of-fit of the projected and normalized images; thresholding the error-of-fit; and determining object positions in accordance with the thresholded error-of-fit. Lowe discloses an invention relating to object recognition for use in locating an object in an image (col. 1 lines 14-16). Lowe teaches that with existing systems used for object recognition impose restrictions on how computer vision systems may be implemented, and that what would be desirable is a computer vision system which is operable to determine the presence or absence of an object, in an image taken from virtually any direction, and under varying lighting conditions (col. 1 lines 30-40). Specifically Loew discloses finding an error residual or degree of correlation (error-of-fit), thresholding the error residual, and if the error residual is determined to be less than the threshold value then the processor indicates the location, size, and orientation of the object (col. 11 line 1-35).

Shiota and Loew are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of object recognition.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Shiota and Loew to find an error-of-fit, threshold the error of fit, and

determine the position of the object in accordance with the thresholded error of fit. The motivation is that it would remove the restrictions of the existing systems and make the invention easier to use. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Shiota and Loew to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 3, it is a matter of design choice as to what type of image is used with the system as specified by Shiota and Loew. As disclosed by Shiota, the shade component removing apparatus is applicable to images other than face images. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a single-photon emission computed tomography image with the system in order to carry out recognition procedures on the image.

Regarding claim 4, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to represent the error-of-fit with a score image in order to better be able to see if the object to be recognized matches, thus the examiner declares official notice.

Claim 10 is dependent on claim 7 anticipated by Shiota. Shiota discloses a CPU 101, an Output unit 105 for displaying the input image. Shiota does not explicitly disclose providing an indication of the location of the detected object within the input image. Loew discloses finding the location of the detected object in the input image (col. 11 lines 32-35). The motivation for combining Shiota and Loew was given above and applies to the limitations of claim 10 as well.

Regarding claim 11, Loew discloses a keyboard in figure 1 which is a user interface adapter.

Claim 12 is similar to claim 1 except claim 12 is a system claim. As both Shiota and Loew disclose a method and apparatus, the same arguments used above apply equally to claim 12.

Claims 14-15 are similar to claim 3-4, thus the same arguments used for claim 3-4 apply equally to claims 14-15.

Claim 18 is similar to claim 1, thus the same arguments used for claim 1 apply equally to claim 18.

Claims 20-21 are similar to claims 3-4, thus the same arguments used for claims 3-4 apply equally to claims 20-21.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiota USPGPUB 2002/0006226.

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 7 anticipated above by Shiota. Regarding claim 3, it is a matter of design choice as to what type of image is used with the system as specified by Shiota. As disclosed by Shiota, the shade component removing apparatus is applicable to images other than face images. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a single-photon emission computed tomography image with the system in order to carry out recognition procedures on the image.

8. Claims 5-6, 16-17, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiota USPGPUB 2002/0006226 in view of Waters et al. *Super Resolution and Image Enhancement Using Novelty Concepts* (hereinafter "Waters").

Regarding claim 5, Shiota discloses a method of forming eigenimages, the method comprising: sub-sampling a plurality of training images (figure 2 numeral 111); forming training images in accordance with the subsampled images; and computing eigenimages corresponding to the training images (paragraph 16). Shiota does not explicitly disclose that the eigenimages are for multiresolution, computing coarse eigenimages, interpolating the coarse eigenimages for a finer resolution; orthonormalizing the interpolated images; and providing pseudo-eigenimages corresponding to the orthonormalized images for a finer resolution.

Waters discloses a method that estimates an underlying scene at a spatial resolution that is finer than the basic detector array of a sensor. The novelty concept develops a set of orthogonal eigenimages from a sequence of image frames. The next image is interrogated for novel changes not present in the previous frames and the eigenimages are updated with new information. The known eigenimages are interpolated to provide an estimate of the detector outputs for arbitrary sensor pointings which can be used to estimate and remove the background from subsequent frames or providing an image of the underlying background at high spatial resolution (all taken from the abstract). The intent of the estimation scheme is to take coarse measurements of a middle image and try to reproduce a higher resolution image (second paragraph from the bottom of page 125, also see figure 1). Waters further discloses that an orthonormal set of eigenimages can be defined from the single value decomposition of a matrix (first paragraph, second column of page 124).



Shiota and Waters are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of removing the background from an image.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Shiota and Waters with the motivation being to allow the system of Shiota to give higher resolution images than that capable of the basic detector array of a sensor. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Shiota and Waters to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Regarding claim 6, Waters discloses that an orthonormal set of eigenimages can be defined from the single value decomposition of a matrix (first paragraph, second column of page 124).

Claims 16-17 are similar to claims 5-6, thus the same arguments used for claims 5-6 apply equally to claims 16-17.

Claims 22-23 are similar to claims 5-6, thus the same arguments used for claims 5-6 apply equally to claims 22-23.

9. Claims 2, 13, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiota USPGPUB 2002/0006226, in view of Lowe USPN 6,711,293 and further in view of Waters et al. *Super Resolution and Image Enhancement Using Novelty Concepts* (hereinafter "Waters").

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 which has been rejected over Shiota in view of Lowe. Shiota discloses a method of forming eigenimages, the method comprising: sub-sampling a plurality of training images (figure 2 numeral 111); forming training images in

accordance with the subsampled images; and computing eigenimages corresponding to the training images (paragraph 16). Shiota does not explicitly disclose that the eigenimages are for multiresolution, computing coarse eigenimages, interpolating the coarse eigenimages for a finer resolution; orthonormalizing the interpolated images; and providing pseudo-eigenimages corresponding to the orthonormalized images for a finer resolution.

Waters discloses a method that estimates an underlying scene at a spatial resolution that is finer than the basic detector array of a sensor. The novelty concept develops a set of orthogonal eigenimages from a sequence of image frames. The next image is interrogated for novel changes not present in the previous frames and the eigenimages are updated with new information. The known eigenimages are interpolated to provide an estimate of the detector outputs for arbitrary sensor pointings which can be used to estimate and remove the background from subsequent frames or providing an image of the underlying background at high spatial resolution (all taken from the abstract). The intent of the estimation scheme is to take coarse measurements of a middle image and try to reproduce a higher resolution image (second paragraph from the bottom of page 125, also see figure 1). Waters further discloses that an orthonormal set of eigenimages can be defined from the single value decomposition of a matrix (first paragraph, second column of page 124).

Shiota and Waters are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor of removing the background from an image.

Art Unit: 2625

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Shiota, Loew and Waters with the motivation being to allow the system of Shiota to give higher resolution images than that capable of the basic detector array of a sensor. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Shiota, Loew, and Waters to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Claim 13 is similar to claim 2 except claim 13 is a system claim. As both Shiota and Loew disclose a method and apparatus, the same arguments used above for claim 2 apply equally to claim 13.

Claim 19 is similar to claim 2, thus the same arguments used for claim 2 apply equally to claim 19.

#### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John B. Strege whose telephone number is (571) 272-7457. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between the hours of 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS



**BHAVESH M. MEHTA**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600